





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/953,719	10/17/1997	DAISUKE YOSHIDA	35.C12338	4164
5514	7590 12/06/2001			
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFE NEW YORK,		PIZIALI, JEFFREY J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2673	
			DATE MAILED: 12/06/2001	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			7			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	08/953,719	YOSHIDA ET AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeff Piziali	2673				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2001 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of this Adverse, the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, the period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(i).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ision and the corresponding amount of the d statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	1			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:					
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying th	ıe			
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendmen	t			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	nt(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or t would be rejected is provided be	o)∏ will be entered and an low or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,5,7-19,21,22 and 24-48.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	<u>20</u> .				
10.⊠ Other: See Continuation Sheet						

Part of Paper No. 21



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendments to independent claims 18, 38 and 43 incorporate the newly added limitation of "a buffer disposed between said D/A converter and said plural signal transfer switches, which stores the analog signal of inverted polarity from the D/A converter." Although this same limitation was previously incorporated into independent claim 1, until now, the limitation has remained separate and foreign from all other independent claims. Adding this limitation to independent claims 18, 38 and 43 would result in the creation of hitherto unseen inventive combinations. Such combinations would constitute new issues, requiring further consideration.

Continuation of 10. Other: The applicants contend, regarding claim 1, that the combination of Lewis (5,589,847) and Yamaguchi (5,438,342) fails to teach signal inversion prior to or in concert with a D/A converter, and instead "requires the signal inversion technique to occur after the D/A converter, allowing for signal decay and introduction of noise" (see Paper No. 19, Page 6, 2nd Paragraph). However, the examiner respectfully notes that claim 1 recites circuitry "which inverts the polarity of the analog signal from the D/A converter" (see Lines 19-22). As the pending claim reads, signal inversion does indeed occur after analog conversion.

The applicants further contend that incorporating the inversion technique of Yamaguchi would render a combination of Lewis, Yamaguchi and Shinya (5,170,158) inoperable. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lewis teaches every limitation found in claim 1, except signal inversion and buffering. Although both signal inversion and buffering are (and were at the time of invention) well known and commonly utilized to respectively limit flicker/crosstalk and synchronize/level signal output; the examiner has chosen to provide specific prior art references and illustrations of such circuitry and techniques. Yamaguchi plainly teaches a standard manner of analog image signal inversion (see Column 2, Lines 1-29); and Shinya clearly illustrates the buffering of DAC image signals (see Fig. 2). Although Lewis, Yamaguchi and Shinya all disclose distinct and unique display devices; the beneficial implications of polarity inversion and signal buffering would render Lewis' display device inoperable.

The applicants point out the distinct and unique driving techniques provided by Shinya and Yamaguchi. However, these references were not provided by the examiner as examples of driving techniques. They were (and remain) intended to serve as prior art examples of polarity inversion and analog buffering.

Finally, the applicants argue the prior art does not even suggest the desirability of combining Yamaguchi's polarity inversion technique and Shinya's output buffers to Lewis' display driving circuitry. However, the applicants do admit that Yamaguchi discloses polarity inversion "as suppressing flicker and crosstalk to some extent" (see Paper No. 19, Page 8, 2nd Paragraph). While Yamauchi does attempt to improve upon the background art shown in Fig. 1, the desirability of polarity inversion is still established just the same. Because Yamaguchi thinks he's stumbled upon an improved driving technique, doesn't mean the benefits of the conventional method have suddenly been invalidated. To see proof, one need look no further than the applicant's own pending invention.

Under such reasoning, the rejection of the claims is deemed proper and thereby maintained.

BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600